



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/041,853	01/07/2002	David G. Way	064731.0257	5513
5073	7590	07/28/2006	EXAMINER	
BAKER BOTTs L.L.P. 2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 75201-2980			CURS, NATHAN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2613	

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/041,853	WAY, DAVID G.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Nathan Curs	2613
--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --		
THE REPLY FILED 13 July 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.		
<p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:</p> <p>a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>b) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</p>		
<p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p>		
NOTICE OF APPEAL		
<p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).</p>		
AMENDMENTS		
<p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because</p> <p>(a) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(b) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(c) <input type="checkbox"/> They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</p> <p>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</p>		
<p>NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).</p>		
<p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).</p>		
<p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.</p>		
<p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</p>		
<p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) <input type="checkbox"/> will not be entered, or b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.</p>		
<p>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</p>		
<p>Claim(s) allowed: _____.</p>		
<p>Claim(s) objected to: _____.</p>		
<p>Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-9 and 11-20</u>.</p>		
<p>Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.</p>		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
<p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</p>		
<p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).</p>		
<p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.</p>		
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		
<p>11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></p>		
<p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____</p>		
<p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p>		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments are not persuasive. The applicant argues that Colbourne teaches away from using dispersion compensating fibers because Colbourne describes advantages of using his invention over using dispersion compensating fibers. However, as previously noted, Colbourne also describes use of dispersion compensating fiber for providing fixed negative or positive dispersion. Colbourne does not qualify as teaching away from the applicant's claimed invention for two reasons. First, Colbourne describing some advantages of using his invention versus using dispersion compensation fiber when addressing the problem Colbourne was concerned with is not the same as Colbourne criticizing or discrediting the use of dispersion compensating fiber in general. Second, Colbourne only criticizes dispersion compensating fiber with respect to its inability to compensate for the wavelength dependence of dispersion. Wavelength dependence of dispersion is not subject matter within the scope of applicant's claimed invention; therefore Colbourne's criticism of dispersion compensating fiber on these grounds does not qualify Colbourne as a teaching away from the applicant's claimed invention, and does not nullify Colbourne's positive teaching of using dispersion compensating fibers for providing fixed negative or positive dispersion. Regarding Delavaux and Keys, the applicant argues that these two references must teach dispersion enhancement due to a deficiency of Colbourne, but this argument is made moot by the examiner's above argument, since in fact Colbourne already teaches providing of positive dispersion. The applicant's remaining arguments with respect to these two references are essentially repeated arguments; therefore, the examiner's prior responses still stand.



JASON CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600